

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-5, 7-29, and 31-36 are pending. As described herein and in previous responses, none of the references of record, either individually or in combination, teach or suggest a live television broadcast displayed via a primary display screen through a Web browser program, such as recited in the pending independent claims. This being the Applicants' 11th Response to at least the 9th combination of references cited by the Office, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn, and that pending claims 1-5, 7-29, and 31-36 be allowed.

35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections

A. Claims 1-5, 7-29, and 31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over U.S. Patent No. 5,398,074 to Duffield et al. (hereinafter, "Duffield") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,081,263 to LeGall et al. (hereinafter, "LeGall") (*Office Action* p.2). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

B. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0066085 to Boyer et al. (hereinafter, "Boyer") in view of Duffield, and further in view of LeGall (*Office Action* p.8). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites a method of displaying recently accessed television channels comprising "displaying a live television broadcast via the primary display screen through a web browser program." Duffield and/or LeGall do not

1 teach or suggest displaying a live television broadcast via the primary display
2 screen through a Web browser program, as recited in claim 1.

3 The Office recognizes that Duffield does not disclose displaying video
4 through a Web browser program (*Office Action* p.3). Duffield only describes a
5 television for multiple picture display of television channels. There is no
6 indication of a Web browser program in Duffield, nor is there even a suggestion of
7 a computing device or system that would possibly support the implementation of a
8 Web browser program in Duffield.

9 LeGall describes a “user’s world” as a scratch pad which is an HTML
10 frame generated based upon resources selected by a user. The display space can
11 include an audio and video window for the displaying of audio/video broadcasts
12 acquired from regular broadcast cable or satellite transmissions (*LeGall*
13 *Summary*). As shown in LeGall Fig. 5, a scratch pad (515) can include a Web
14 browser (530) as an Internet resource (520) and/or can include an audio/video
15 window (540) (not identified in Fig. 5; shown only as “A/V”) from a broadcast
16 source “A/V” (*LeGall* col.5, line 62 to col.6, line 1).

17 Although LeGall describes that a selection from a broadcast source can be
18 viewed in an audio/video window that is separate from a Web browser, LeGall
19 does not teach or suggest displaying a live television broadcast via the primary
20 display screen through a Web browser program, as recited in claim 1.

21 The Office cites to LeGall at col.2, lines 25-29 for video or broadcast
22 resources, and cites to col.6, lines 1-4 which describes that the audio/video
23 window (540) on the scratch pad (515) in Fig. 5 supports “enhanced programming,
24 such as in web pages with live audio and video”. However, neither section of
25

1 LeGall describes displaying a live television broadcast through a Web browser
2 program, as recited in claim 1.

3 The Office also cites to LeGall at col.7, lines 17-28 with reference to
4 Fig. 7c for an example of an audio/video display window (720), and cites to col.8,
5 lines 3-8 which describes that the “user’s world” is represented by an HTML
6 frame, and that a Web browser can be used to view Web sites that are part of the
7 user’s world. For example, a Web site (535) can be viewed with the HTML
8 browser (530) as shown in Fig. 5. Again, neither of these sections of LeGall
9 describes displaying a live television broadcast through a Web browser program,
10 as recited in claim 1.

11 Further, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office that it would have
12 been obvious to modify the system of Duffield by presenting a live television
13 broadcast through a Web browser as described by DeGall (*Office Action* p.3).
14 There is no indication of a Web browser program in Duffield, nor is there even a
15 suggestion of a computing device or system that would possibly support the
16 implementation of a Web browser program in Duffield. Further, there is no
17 indication in DeGall of displaying a live television broadcast through a Web
18 browser program. As such, there is no motivation to combine DeGall with
19 Duffield.

20 Accordingly, claim 1 along with dependent claims 2-5 and 7-19 are
21 allowable over the Duffield-DeGall combination and Applicant respectfully
22 requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

23
24 **Claim 8** recites “enlarging the active small display screen to full-screen
25 mode and removing the remaining small display screens”. The Office recognizes

1 that "Duffield does not disclose removing the remaining secondary video
2 pictures", and takes Official Notice that the recited feature(s) are well known
3 (*Office Action* pp.3-4).

4 Applicant respectfully disagrees, because the allegedly well known facts
5 are not capable of "instant and unquestionable demonstration," as required to
6 make a rejection based on Official Notice (*see* MPEP § 2144.03(A)). As the
7 Examiner is likely aware, Applicant is required to challenge statements that are
8 not supported on the record, and failure to do so will be construed as an admission
9 by the Applicant that the statement is true (M.P.E.P. §2144.03). Therefore, the
10 Examiner is requested to cite a reference supporting the position that it would have
11 been obvious for "enlarging the active small display screen to full-screen mode
12 and removing the remaining small display screens", as recited in claim 8. If the
13 Examiner is unable to provide such a reference, and is relying on facts based on
14 personal knowledge, Applicant hereby requests that such facts be set forth in an
15 affidavit from the Examiner under 37 C.F.R. 1.104(d)(2). Absent substantiation, it
16 is respectfully requested that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

17
18 Independent **Claims 20, 26, and 33-35** recite a similar feature of displaying
19 a live television broadcast via the primary display screen through a web browser
20 program. For at least the reasons described above in the response to the rejection
21 of claim 1, independent claims 20, 26, and 33-35 are allowable over the
22 Duffield-DeGall combination and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103
23 rejection be withdrawn.

24 In addition, claims 21-25 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon
25 claim 20 (either directly or indirectly), and claims 27-28 are allowable by virtue of

1 their dependency upon claim 26. Similar to claim 8, Applicant also requests the
2 Examiner to cite a reference supporting the position that it would have been
3 obvious for “enlarging the active small display screen to full-screen mode and
4 removing the remaining small display screens”, as recited in claim 21.

5
6 **Claim 29** recites that the primary display screen comprises a live television
7 broadcast displayed through an interactive display environment including World
8 Wide Web content. Duffield and/or DeGall do not teach or suggest a live
9 television broadcast displayed through an interactive display environment
10 including World Wide Web content, as recited in claim 29. Further, for at least
11 the reasons described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, claim 29
12 along with dependent claims 31-32 are allowable over the Duffield-DeGall
13 combination and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be
14 withdrawn.

15
16 **Claim 36** recites the primary display screen capable of displaying a live
17 television broadcast through a web browser program. For at least the reasons
18 described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, claim 36 is allowable
19 over the Duffield-DeGall combination. Claim 36 is also allowable over the
20 Boyer-Duffield-DeGall combination because Boyer does not address the
21 deficiencies of either Duffield or DeGall as described above in the response to the
22 rejection of claim 1. Accordingly, the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Respectfully Submitted,

By: Alan M. Mossel

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25